

# Appendix

## J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth—Part IX

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include part IX of a series appearing in the September 14, 1963, issue of Human Events containing a review of Victor Lasky's book "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth":

KENNEDY STEAMROLLERS CONVENTION, PICKS ARCH-RIVAL JOHNSON AS VEEP—PART IX

On Friday, July 8, 1960, LYNDON JOHNSON swept into Los Angeles with his Texas sombrero filled with jibes at the candidate with the "Madison Avenue toothpaste smile." The first of the presidential contenders to arrive on the scene JOHNSON immediately denounced "the constant, crude efforts to smear candidates by guilt by association." He referred to well-circulated rumors that he was being supported by Jimmy Hoffa and the Teamsters Union.

"I really think," he told a mammoth press conference at the Hotel Biltmore, "that Mr. Kennedy, his father, and his brother have been running against Mr. Hoffa for several years now \* \* \* the closer we get to the nomination, the hotter their breath becomes."

At the time, he indicated that he would not reject Senator Kennedy as his vice-presidential running mate. "The Vice-Presidency is a good place for a young man who needs experience," he observed.

But LYNDON JOHNSON—old "pro" that he was—knew that the only hope of stopping Kennedy lay in a deadlock that, in all probability, would result in Adlai Stevenson (whom he disliked intensely) as the compromise candidate.

Not that John F. Kennedy had the nomination nailed down when the convention opened. The New York Times estimated he was 160 votes short of the 761 needed to win. But his team oozed with supreme confidence perhaps born of the knowledge of the inevitability of victory.

#### A VARIED IMAGE

Political historians will have a time for themselves in analyzing the contrasting ideological pitches made in Kennedy's behalf by widely differing organizational associates.

Among liberals, and notably erstwhile Stevenson devotees, men like Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith pointed to Kennedy's qualifications as shown on the voting index of Americans for Democratic Action. What disturbed some liberals, however, was that Kennedy's apologists were constantly reminding them of how much growth potential there was in Jack. Was the White House ever intended to be a national laboratory, a test center, where promising young men could try out?

Among conservatives, especially southerners, the pitch was in the opposite direction. They used the voting index of ACA—Americans for Constitution Action, the right-wing group—which, according to Kennedy's backers, showed that the Senator was "1 percent less liberal" than Stu Symington.

#### LAW LESSON FOR BOBBY

Nerve center of the Kennedy operation, which reached into each of the 50 State delegations, was a suite of rooms on the eighth floor of the Biltmore. Here shirt-sleeved Bobby Kennedy was directing convention strategy with Kenny O'Donnell, Larry O'Brien and others out of the tight inside group.

These were nonideologues. Their only concern was to win. Issues were only of importance if they would help Jack win. A revealing episode occurred the Friday night before the convention opened. Bobby Kennedy, interviewed on TV, was asked what he thought about the Connally amendment. Bobby, who was already being touted as Attorney General if his brother won the Presidency, confessed he had never heard of the amendment.

The amendment, under which the United States could not be halled into the World Court without its permission, was explained to the future chief law officer of the United States.

Bobby ran the Los Angeles operation in a manner that soon earned him the nickname "Raul," after Fidel Castro's younger brother. He barked orders at the staff like a drill sergeant. His undiplomatic approach toward politicians many years his senior created resentment. "He talked to us like he was talking to Jimmy Hoffa," one politician complained.

#### DISNEYLAND OFF LIMITS

Once he gave his staff a dressing-down in Los Angeles that has become legendary. Bobby discovered that his "serfs" had visited Disneyland. They had taken time, he reminded them icily, which could have been put to better use for "my brother, the Senator." They weren't brought to Los Angeles to frolic in the sun. Henceforth, Disneyland was off limits.

Moreover, he was distressed about the tardiness of some staff members. When he called a meeting, he expected his troops to appear at the appointed time—not 5 minutes before or 5 minutes afterward. "And that's the way it's going to be if you want to remain on the Kennedy team," he barked.

Everything was pretty well under control by the time John F. Kennedy arrived in Los Angeles. It was Saturday, July 9, and on hand to greet "Lochinvar"—as James Reston persisted in calling him—were some 2,000 very girlish fans who squealed with delight as their hero consented to say a few historic words.

"A few days ago another candidate [JOHNSON] said that we needed a man with a little gray in his hair," said Kennedy. "We put that gray in his hair and we will continue to do so."

Taking nothing for granted, Jack Kennedy prowled the far reaches of Los Angeles, invading caucus after caucus with his plea for support, a plea always tempered with a recognition of the regional needs of the delegates to whom he was talking.

Thus, he told Iowans he intended to return to Washington to introduce a bill during the special session to put the farmer on his feet. "You see," the Dallas News commented, "a quick survey at the convention showed him a little weak in the farm belt. About all that this young millionaire socialist knows about farming is that there's votes in them thar fields. He is about as qualified to legislate on agriculture as a Japanese juditsu artist."

#### LYNDON TEES OFF

LYNDON JOHNSON had made up his mind to keep fighting. The break JOHNSON had been waiting for came on Tuesday. In routine fashion, Kennedy headquarters had sent wires to various delegations requesting an audience for Jack. JOHNSON replied with a telegram suggesting a joint caucus of the Texas and Massachusetts delegations and a debate on the major issues.

Kennedy declined the honor and assumed the debate was off. LYNDON assumed no such thing and announced that Texas would hold an important business meeting at 2:15 p.m., and that the delegation would expect Kennedy and the Massachusetts delegation in the grand ballroom of the Biltmore.

A regiment of newsmen and television people took over the ballroom. At 2:45 p.m., LYNDON rode in with his boys from the cattle country, and asked whether anyone who could speak for Kennedy knew where the Senator was. The Senator was upstairs in apartment Q, not knowing what to do. The phone rang. It was Governor Hollings, of South Carolina. "You're going down to that debate, aren't you?" Hollings asked. Jack said he didn't think so. "You'd better get down there," drawled the South Carolinian. "I'm watching that commentator on TV and he'll ruin you if you don't."

It was 3:12 p.m., before the Senator of that book on political courage arrived in the jam-packed ballroom. As he rose to speak, Kennedy's trembling legs made his trousers flutter, and beads of sweat tumbled from his upper lip. He made a set speech about the need for developing natural resources, facing up to new problems and so forth.

Against Kennedy's conciliatory remarks, LYNDON unleashed a barrage of sarcasm, the likes of which have rarely been heard in a face-to-face encounter. JOHNSON pistol-whipped his guest unmercifully. He repeatedly drew attention to Kennedy's voting record and Senate absenteeism. He questioned Kennedy's devotion to the farmer and reminded his audience that he was for rural telephones long before some people had even seen an outhouse. And he brought up the religious issue, an action that did not appear to appeal to Kennedy. "I think, Jack, we Protestants proved in West Virginia that we'll vote for a Catholic," he bawled. "What we want is some of the Catholic States to prove that they'll vote for a Protestant."

And, bellowed JOHNSON, where were certain people during all these quorum calls on the civil rights bill? "There were 45 rollcalls on civil rights in recent months," he observed. "LYNDON JOHNSON answered every one of them." But, he added, there were some people who would like to be President who failed to set much of a record. "I know Senators who missed as many as 34 of those rollcalls," he thundered.

Kennedy's face remained expressionless. And when JOHNSON finally concluded, Kennedy arose and made jokes. "The Senator wasn't specific in his remarks about voting on civil rights legislation," said Kennedy, "so I presume he was talking about some other candidate."

But by Wednesday, LYNDON knew it was all too late. When the rollcall was taken that day the tally was Kennedy, 806; JOHNSON, 409; SYMINGTON, 86; Stevenson, 79½. Through the tumult came Missouri's move to declare the nomination by acclamation. Despite a chorus of no's, the Chair ruled that Kennedy had been unanimously nominated.

A7143

November 19

Senator OLIN JOHNSTON of South Carolina, immediately sprang to his feet and made a dramatic effort to correct the record. The vote for Kennedy was not unanimous. South Carolina stood steadfastly against Kennedy even after he had won. When the party leadership refused to recognize JOHNSTON, the Senator rushed to the platform, which was blocked so that nobody could enter without the consent of the platform bosses.

Chairman Paul Butler refused to let the South Carolinian in, so OLIN JOHNSTON stood on the floor and yelled his denunciation at Butler.

#### THE MORNING AFTER

The next day stunned disbelief swept over the delegates. John F. Kennedy had announced, in the tones of a corporation executive announcing a shift in staff personnel, that Lyndon B. Johnson would be his running mate.

When the news hit the Symington people, they were thunderstruck. "Partner," said Missouri's James Blair, "we've just been run over by a steamroller."

"I'm sick," announced Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

"I'm shocked," gasped Robert Nathan, former ADA national chairman.

A Kennedy-Johnson ticket had long been the dream of Joseph P. Kennedy. In 1959, he had talked to Sam Rayburn on the subject. At that time Johnson, informed of the conversation, uttered a short ugly expletive.

In New York, Joseph P. Kennedy had watched his son's acceptance speech at the home of Time-Life's Henry Luce. His absence from the vast coliseum was noticeable that night as, one by one, the Kennedys were introduced by Chairman LeRoy Collins.

"If there are any Kennedys I have omitted, please let me know," Collins concluded.

There was a titter in the huge crowd. "Where's Joe?" people asked.

"As someone observed," wrote Randolph Churchill, "it was a lovely party, but where was the host?"

old truths, she discovered, have now been rewritten.

In the fifth edition (and in the Sixth Collegiate of 1949, also), liberty was defined in this fashion: "Individual liberty now generally involves freedom of the person in going and coming (personal liberty), equality before the courts, security of private property, freedom of opinion and its expression, and freedom of conscience." The new Seventh Collegiate defines liberty as "the power to do as one pleases . . . the positive enjoyment of various social, political, or economic rights and privileges."

In the fifth edition (and also in the sixth), democracy was defined as a system of government in which the supreme power is "retained by the people." In the new seventh edition, the verb is subtly altered. Now democracy is a system of government in which the supreme power is "vested in the people." There is an enormous difference—the difference between owning property by inheritance and merely renting property by lease. How many students, we wonder, ever will pause to puzzle this out? How many will check back to see that once upon a time, in specific and unequivocal terms, liberty embraced security of private property? Now liberty, by Webster's definition, involves no more than "various rights and privileges."

In George Orwell's terrifying "1984," the masters of a totalitarian society see to it that all encyclopedias and reference works constantly are rewritten, so that every item inconsistent with the Government's policy will be obliterated. The offending items then are dropped down the memory hole. There are times, when these little discoveries of changed definitions creep across the desk, that we suspect Mr. Orwell dated his society 20 years too far in the future.

#### Situation Report

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on November 13, Mr. Martin Agronsky, a commentator for the National Broadcasting Co., gave the following situation report on the 11 o'clock news broadcast.

It seems to me to be a very clear and concise statement on the Otepka case and furnishes sufficient background to explain the recent resignations of Mr. Reilly and his assistant.

This case also gives weight to the theory that the Foreign Service clique in the State Department by getting rid of Otepka has now revenged the dismissal and prosecution of Alger Hiss.

The report follows:

#### SITUATION REPORT

The affair of the State Department's overzealous security section employee, Mr. Otto F. Otepka, is off the front pages for the moment. Mr. Otepka is the gentleman who was fired from the State Department's Security Division when it was learned he had been revealing the Division's secrets to a Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Some of the committee's members, particularly Nebraska's Republican Senator Hruska, sought to save Mr. Otepka from punishment for functioning as his stool pigeon. Mr. Hruska released letters showing that the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, John F.

Reilly, and his two chief assistants, had admitted installing an eavesdropping device in Otepka's office and collecting papers from his "burn basket"—presumably to get the goods on him when they learned he was spilling the beans to the committee about them. Senator Hruska indicated this was no way to deal with so highly motivated an informer as Mr. Otepka. He said he wants Reilly and company investigated.

The State Department has ordered Reilly and his chief assistant to go on leave while this matter is examined further. Exactly what's happening now is a bit obscure. It raises a question best posed in the words of the song that goes: "Who will investigate the guy who investigates, the guy who investigates me?"

The State Department undoubtedly wishes it had access to some kind of Orwellian "memory hole" into which it could dump the whole smelly incident and forget it ever took place.

It did take place though. What's more it demonstrates to all State Department employees that they are constantly under the eye of a "big brother" security system whose operators are not only willing to use phone taps as a matter of course but are just as willing to lie about it when it suits them.

Last August when I made my first visit to Moscow, I was briefed by other correspondents on post there, and by our Embassy officials, on the importance of remembering that every word I spoke on a telephone might be overheard by Soviet security agents. When I lunched at a foreign embassy, the ambassador, an old friend, would discuss only trivialities at the table. He then asked me to walk with him in the garden. Once there he said, "Now we can talk. I'm afraid my whole Embassy is wired for sound. We make it a rule never to say anything inside the Embassy we would mind having overheard."

I asked him how he could tolerate living in such an atmosphere of constant mistrust, always overshadowed by security surveillance. "It's not very pleasant," he said, "but one must learn to live with it in a police state."

For westerners, it is this situation which poisons living in the capital of the Soviet Union.

It is an insidious poison, one which can no longer be unfamiliar to those who work in the State Department here, in the Capital of the United States.

#### Toward Assateague Unity

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. J. GLENN BEALL**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, earlier this year, the Secretary of the Interior proposed a plan, contemplating Federal development of Assateague Island, in Worcester County, Md. Subsequently, I joined Senator BREWSTER in introducing S. 2128, which embodies the Secretary's proposal.

During the past several months, there have been numerous discussions on this subject, and alternate proposals have been offered. An alternate proposal has been introduced by Congressman ROGERS C. B. MORTON, of Maryland.

On Friday, November 8, the Star Democrat, of Easton, Md., carried an editorial entitled, "Toward Assateague Unity."

#### Liberty, Revised

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. STROM THURMOND**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the November 2, 1963, issue of the Richmond News-Leader contains an interesting editorial on the definitions of the word "liberty." The editorial is entitled "Liberty, Revised." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### LIBERTY, REVISED

Two of the most interesting people in this Commonwealth, Capt. and Mrs. Robert W. Orrell of Cardinal, publish an occasional bulletin known as Our Country. This is a literate, stoutly conservative bulletin, written and distributed as a labor of love and a work of patriotism.

In their current issue, Mrs. Orrell writes of some of the strange revisions that have been made in Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. She recently abandoned her dog-eared Fifth Collegiate, dating from 1936-41, in favor of the new Seventh Collegiate. Some